

20

A  
LETTER  
FROM A  
FRENCH LAWYER  
TO AN  
ENGLISH GENTLEMAN,  
Upon the Present  
REVOLUTION.

---

LICENSED,

May the 27. 1689.

*J. Frazer.*

---

L O N D O N :

Printed for **Ric. Chiswell** at the *Rose and Crown* in  
St. Paul's Church-yard. MDCLXXXIX.

REVOLUTION

THE REVOLUTION

FOR THE REVOLUTION

1

---

A  
L E T T E R

From a

F R E N C H L A W Y E R

To An

E N G L I S H G E N T L E M A N , &c.

I Have already told you, and must tell it you again, that I do not believe, that the Court of *France* puts any upon writing against the Proceedings of the Prince of *Orange*, or of the Conventions of *England* and *Scotland* in this important Juncture. I do not deny but that some *Monck*, or nameless Author, transported with blind Zeal, may belch out his Venom upon this Miraculous Event, to see all the designs of *James* the Second to prove so unhappily abortive : but I much question whether any of the Ministers of State and Council to *Lewis* the Fourteenth, will ever agree to have those Questions discuss'd, which must be handled in order to satisfy the Publick, about the Principles and Grounds of that Revolution.

A 2

volution. Believe me, Sir, they understand their own Interest better, than to be guilty of so great an oversight.

In asserting this, I do not only consider the Circumstances, in which they find themselves at present, and whereof they cannot but easily foresee the Consequences. The Policy of *France* hindred that Court from alledging any thing against the death of *Charles* the First, and made them to sollicite an Alliance with *Cromwel*, because it appear'd suitable to their Interests; and upon the same account, they will, as soon as handsomly they can, make it their business to find out a way to be reconciled to King *William*, and to rid themselves of the Private League they have with *James* the Second. But my business at present is to represent to you this matter, according to the Sense of those who are skilful in the Laws of *France*; though indeed that Kingdom at present seems wholly changed as to it Laws and Government.

Forasmuch as you desire, Sir, that I should give you my Reasons for being of this Opinion, because it seems altogether improbable to you, that *France* should not employ his most able Pens to defend *James* the Second, and to expose the King and the Conventions of *England* and *Scotland*, at this time when he is sending Forces and Money to *Ireland*; to restore *James* the Second, and to overthrow King *William*; I shall endeavour to satisfy you herein, and shall do it the more willingly, because I believe the clearing of this Matter may be of use to the Government of *England*, whose Peace and Tranquillity I hope *France* shall never be able to disturb. The *French* Writers that would Treat of this matter, must bound their Discourse within



within these six Questions, which contain all that can be said on this Occasion.

1<sup>st</sup>. Whether the Prince of *Orange* could justly assault King *James* the Second, in order to oblige him to reform the Government, according to the Resolves of a Free Parliament, the calling whereof he demanded for that purpose?

2<sup>d</sup>. Whether he had reason to alledge the Matter of the Pretended Prince of *Wales*, as one of the Grounds of Complaint he had against *James* the Second, and to demand the Examination and Decision of it, in a Free Parliament?

3<sup>d</sup>. Whether the Lords, the Gentry and Corporations of the Kingdom, could with Justice joyn themselves with the Prince of *Orange*, to oblige King *James* the Second to call a Parliament, to redress the Disorders he had caused in the Government?

4<sup>th</sup>. Whether King *James* the Second, by his choice of retiring to *France*, rather than to agree to the Proposals made to him, hath not abandon'd the Government, and thereby made the Calling of the Convention necessary to restore some form of Government, and to prevent the Mischief of Anarchy?

5<sup>th</sup>. Whether it was in the power of the Convention, to dispose of the Crown in favour of the Prince of *Orange* and of the Princess his Wife, without troubling themselves to recal *James* the Second, in order to Treat with him?

6<sup>th</sup>. Whether the Oaths sworn to *James* the Second do still oblige *Englishmen*, since his abandoning of the Kingdom, and after that the Convention hath rais'd King *William* and Queen *Mary* to the Throne?

The first of these, is a Question of Law, and takes the Matter of Fact for granted, viz. That King *James* had overturn'd

overtur'd the Government ; about which we are to refer our selves to Matters publicly known to all the Nation, yea to all Europe. Now, this supposed, no *French Lawyer* can deny, but that the Prince of *Orange*, Husband of the first Princess of the Blood, and presumptive Heiress of the Crown, had right to oppose himself against the overturning of the Government, and the abrogation of the Fundamental Laws thereof. Had the Prince of *Orange* had no other ground, for his interposing in the Affairs of *England* but as he was a Neighbour Prince, and consequently Interested in the Liberty of that Government, which he could not see destroy'd, without hazarding his own ruin, this would have been sufficient to justify his Enterprize. Nothing but this could justify the Enterprize of *Henry II.* King of *France*, when he attack'd the Emperor *Charles V.* who Invaded the Rights of the Princes of the Empire, which undertaking of his gain'd him the Title of *Protector of the German Liberty*. But the Prince of *Orange* had a far better ground than so, for his Character of Prince of the Blood; and Husband to the Presumptive Heiress of the Crown, gave him a Natural Right, and Authority to undertake what he did. This is a Truth so universally acknowledged and exemplified in the Kingdom of *France*, that we can give as many Instances of it, as the Kings of *France* have made attempts against the Liberty of the State. *Lewis XIV.* can confirm this more than any of his Predecessors; his Uncle *Gaston*, Duke of *Orleans*, and the Princes of the Blood, having leagued themselves, and taken up Arms, to oppose themselves against the Tyranny which the Queen Regent and Cardinal *Mazarine*, did endeavour to introduce, during the Kings Minority. The Princes of *France* had done as much before in the Reign of *Lewis XI.* which occasion'd the War for the Common Good,

as it was called, being undertaken by the Princes, and almost all the Estates of the Land; not to speak now of what past in the time of *Charles IX.* and *Henry the III.* and afterward under *Lewis XIII.* upon occasion of the *Marquis d'Ancre*, and the Constable *Luines*.

The 2d. Question may more easily be decided than the first, which yet is so clear and incontestable, as we have just now seen. Tho' the Civil Law be not an absolute Rule for all *France*, yet is it of so great Authority, that Questions are ordinarily determin'd by it, when there is no Customary Right that derogates from it. Now what can a *French* Lawyer say in the Case of the Pretended Prince of *Wales*, when he sees that *James II.* hath not observed any of those cautionary Forms with respect to the Government, or his own Family, which the Law in that occasion Prescribes. We find this Law in the *Digest. lib. 25. tit. 4.* where is Treated concerning the Forms, which a Woman big with Child, or that pretends to be so, is to observe at her Delivery, when her Child is to deprive the Presumptive Heirs of their Succession. We need only to compare these Forms and Precautions, with the Account we have of the Delivery of the Queen of *England*, to justify the Exception of the Prince of *Orange* against that pretended Delivery. As soon as a *French* Lawyer reflects on the great care the Kings of *France* have always taken on this Occasion, (whose exactness herein it seems *James II.* had no mind at all to imitate) he will be forc'd to be silent. *Charles the VII.* Complains, that the *Dauphin* (who was afterwards *Lewis the XI.*) acquaints him that his Wife was brought to bed, without having inform'd him of her being with Child, because without that advice he could not send the Princes of the Blood to assist at the Delivery of the *Dauphiness*, who  
was

was then out of the Kingdom with her Husband, notwithstanding that that Prince then born could not prejudice the Right of any of the Princes, as having no right to the Crown till after his Fathers death, who was then only *Dauphin of France*: Whereas *James II.* took no care that either of his Daughters, or any deputed by them, should be present at his Queens Delivery, when the Child to be born was no less than a Prince of *Wales*, which directly excluded them from the Succession. Certainly if the Action of the Prince of *Orange* against this strange way of Proceeding be not Just, I do not know whether ever any were so; and his Moderation was no less than his Justice, in referring this great Interest of his to the discussion of the Parliament, who were the only competent Judges of this Controversie. We have here the Case of a Sovereign Prince, who is injur'd in his Succession to three Kingdoms, and who notwithstanding refers the whole deciding of that Question, which he might have determined by the right of Arms, to a Parliament, to whose Judgment he submits himself, as having only taken up Arms to oblige the King to own that Tribunal, and to let his Witnesses be examined, and the Question to be decided by them.

It is hard to guess, who advis'd *James* the Second, a little before the Landing of the Prince of *Orange*, to make his Witnesses to declare what they knew concerning the Queens being brought to bed. Thus much is certain, that it was not done at the request of the Prince of *Orange*, nor at his demand, and consequently that Information stands for nothing in Law; and it is as certain that *James* the Second's Council were no competent Judges to take this Information, or to hear the Witnesses  
in

in a matter of so great importance, which belong'd only to the Representatives of the State, who alone have Right to examine Matters about the Point of Succession, upon any emergent Difficulties. But it is yet more difficult to comprehend how *JAMES II.* finding himself obliged to quit the Government, because he was averse to consent to any Proposals made by the Prince of *ORANGE*, and the Government, which was then joyn'd with him, could by any Rules of Prudence, Transport out of the Kingdom, the pretended Prince of *WALEES*, his Wife, and all the chief Witnesses that had deposed in that case; for what has he done else, by this Proceeding, but to confirm the strong Suspicions of foul Play in the case, by making it appear, That he would not have that matter pryed into, which was of so great Importance to the State? One would think he might have trusted the Prince of *WALEES* with the Bishops, or some of the Lords, in whom he had the greatest Confidence, because of their tryed Integrity; he knew well enough, that a Parliament of *England*, consisting of near Eight hundred Heads, are not likely to suffer themselves to be carried away by a blind Passion, to trample under their Feet all the Laws of Justice and Equity, in the Face of the whole World. To speak the truth, Tho it had been a thing generally owned, That the Prince of *WALEES* was not Supposititious; yet it is evident, the late King did all he well could be supposed to do, to persuade the Parliament, that he endeavour'd to conceal from publick Knowledge, the Examination of a matter, which could not but cover him with Shame and Confusion. To say, That he could not leave the Prince of *WALEES*, nor

the Witnesses of his Birth in *England*, considering the Condition to which he was then reduced, is to say nothing that can satisfy. But, pray, let any Man tell me, how the Parliament could have acted otherwise than they have done. *JAMES II.* knew by the common Vogue, that he was accused, of having a design to transport the Crown from the Lawful Heirefs, to a Supposititious Child; the Matter being such as could not be decided, but by a Parliament; the calling of one is demanded of him from all Parts, with great earnestness. The Prince of *ORANGE* takes up Arms to second this demand, as well for the Discussion of this Point, as for the re-establishment of the Laws; and *JAMES II.* not only refuseth to call a Parliament, with the highest Obstinacy; but also leaves the Kingdom, takes the Child along with him, and all the chief Witnesses, whose Presence was necessary in this case, except we should suppose, that it will please God to send an Angel to decide the Controversy by his own personal Evidence. The Parliament had no reason, but to consider this Proceeding of *JAMES II.* as a Proceeding most contrary to Law and Equity, and to take measures accordingly, to prevent the Ruin of the State, which his Flight had left without a form of Government; for to have waited for his return at the head of an Army, to have call'd a Parliament, by whom this question might have been lawfully determined, would have been the highest degree of folly, and no better than stark madness.

As for the third Question, I can assure you, That a *French Lawyer* would not find the least Difficulty to resolve it. 'Tis about Fourteen years since, that the *Charter* granted by King *John*, was publish'd in

*France,*



*France*, which is so express as to this Point, that I do not see what can be objected against it. The said *Charter* is with good reason lookt upon in *England* as a Fundamental Law. King *John* published the said *Charter* in the year 1215. after that the Barons had declared war against him, and had oblig'd him by force to redress the Grievances of the Nation. The beginning of it is express in terms to this purpose; 'That the said *Charter* was made with the Advice of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and of *Pandolphus*, Nuncio to Pope *Innocent III.* That forasmuch as the Disorders and Abuses crept into the Government, were without number, the King consented to rectifie the same at the pleasure of the Twenty five Barons, chosen by the Government, and invested with Power, in case the King should continue to maintain the said Disorders, to compel him by force to redress them, by seizing his Castles, Lands and Revenue; and by pursuing those to utter destruction, that should take up Arms for him; the King excepting none from that Penalty, save only his own Person, the Queen, and his Children. But what is more yet, he enjoins all his Subjects, under the severest Penalties, to swear to be obedient to the Orders of the said Barons, without reserve. We are to take special notice of two things in This *Charter*; the one is, That the King by this Declaration owns, That the Lords and the Government had just cause to take up Arms against him: The other is, That his consenting that the matter should be referred to a certain number of Barons, who had power to compel him by force of Arms to do justice, was not any mitigation in favour of the King, to render

his Condition more tolerable, but rather a severe Penalty denounced against himself, in case he should fail to perform the Conditions of the said Treaty. And lest any one should think that these Concessions of King *John* were strange and unusual, the War in *France*, for the *Common good*, was terminated with a like Treaty. King *Lewis XI.* chusing rather to follow his disordinate Fancy, than the wise Laws of the Government, and placing his Greatness and Glory in oppressing of his Subjects: This King, of whom some have said, That he set free the Kings of *France* from their state of Pupillage and Minority; but of whom *Mezeray* more truly saith, That he put them out of their Wits and Reason. This King, I say, having omitted nothing that was proper to overturn the Laws and Government, forced the Princes and great Lords to joyn and make war against him; which they did with so much success, that at last they obliged him to follow the model of King *John*. He was fain to consent, That thirty six persons should be named of the most considerable of the Kingdom, twelve of the Nobility, twelve of the Clergy, and twelve of the Learned in the Law, to consider of ways to redress the Grievances of the People, and to remedy the Disorders of the Government, and to submit himself to their decision. This is a thing recorded by all the Annalists of *France*, both Ancient and Modern. *Phil. de Com. Lib. 1. c. 2.* and happened about two hundred years ago. But it is well known, that the Princes of *France* have several times since that, followed the same Example, both under the Reign of *Lewis XIII.* and *Lewis XIV.* as taking it to be their Right, to preserve the Laws and Government, when they saw, that the taking  
away



away of the States General, had deprived them of the means of seeking redress by way of Remonstrance.

I pass on to the fourth Question, viz. Whether JAMES II. in chusing rather to retire to *France*, than to comply with the Proposals offer'd to him; hath abandoned the Crown, and thereby made the Convention of the Deputies of the States necessary, to prevent the Kingdom from being left without any Form of Government at all? This Question contains two others; the first is, Whether King JAMES II. by retiring out of the Kingdom, did abandon the Crown? The other, Whether his going away, hath rendered the Convention of the Estates necessary and lawful, to provide for the Government? The first is very easily decided, according to the Laws of *France*; 'tis taken for granted in *France*, as every where else, That when a King, maintaining his unjust Proceedings by force of Arms, to the last, is forced by the Princes and Great Men of the Nation, who undertake the defence of the Government, to retire out of the Kingdom, That then the Persons that have been forced to take up Arms in defence of the Government, may restore the State to the happy condition of a Government delivered from Tyranny. The History of *France* furnisheth us with several Instances of this nature. When *Childeric* was chased out of the Kingdom by the *Franks*, because of his Crimes, and thereupon retired to the King of *Burgundy*; the Estates being assembled, chose another King. We have many like Passages in the History of *France*; and *Lewis* the XIth was so wise as to prevent this Inconvenience, which threatned him, when instead of leaving *France*, as he had at first resolved, and retiring to the Court of an *Italian* Prince, his

his Friend, because he had no stomach to redress the Abuses he had committed; he not only staid in the Kingdom, but consented also, That the redressing of Grievances should be referred to the Judgment of Thirty six chief Persons of the Kingdom, as we find it recorded in all Historians. As for the other Question, Whether upon King *JAMES II.* his abandoning of the Government, the Convention was both necessary and lawful? The same would be with no less ease resolved by the *French* Lawyers. They hold it for a constant truth, *That the Sovereign Power is in the Body of the Estates*; whence it follows, that in the Case here before us, their assembling must be both necessary and lawful. Neither do they only ground this their Judgment upon divers Examples; as upon the Assembly of Estates, when the Kings, *John*, *St. Lewis*, and *Francis I.* were Prisoners; but above all, upon the nature of the Government. They set down these Maxims, *First*, That the State of *France*, as well as that of *England*, is a Government mixt of Monarchy, Aristocracy and Democracy, where every one of those has its Rights, and the Power of preserving them. *Secondly*, That when Princes become incorrigible, the Estates are the Curb, whereby they are to be brought to Reason. *Thirdly*, That the Princes, who are the Members of the said Estates, may oppose themselves against any such Enterprises of their Kings. *Fourthly*, That the Estates, being the Seat of the Sovereign Power, whereof the Kings are only the Keepers or Guardians, they may depose those Kings that abuse it for the overthrow of the Kingdom. *Fifthly*, That therefore the Estates are both necessary and lawful in such occasions, though it be the customary Right of the King to call them. This may be seen in  
all

all the Writings of the *French* Lawyers, who have writ concerning the State of *France*, and who have examin'd the Rights of the King, and of the Estates General, with any knowledg or reputation. I know that of late times, and since the Cessation of the Estates, none have been so bold to treat of this Subject, which could not be done without danger, under the Absolute Government they have of late introduced. But the Writings of *French* Lawyers that lived in the foregoing Age, concerning this matter, represent this Case, as I have said: and it is difficult, even at this time, to oppose these their Sentiments, without being his'd at for so doing, tho' at present there be no liberty to dispute the practise of contrary Maxims. Thus much is certain, That if any *French* Lawyer should undertake to defend the Maxims of Absolute Monarchy in *France*, he would be soon put to silence, by representing to him, That the last Age hath supposed and defended the contrary, as Maxims of the most constant Truth, and which cannot be call'd in question by any who have read the History of *France* with the least Attention. In a word, Nothing can be objected to the *English*, but that they have had more courage to defend their Rights than the *French*; and that tho' the Government of *England* be established on the same Laws, they have not been endowed with so much Patience or Stupidity, to suffer it to degenerate into an Arbitrary and Unbounded Government, as the *French* have been.

To the fifth Question, I answer, That *France* maintains as a Maxim of undoubted Truth, That the Crown cannot be put into the Hands of a Prince who is not of the Religion of the State. The Resistance they made against *Henry IV.* until that he had embraced the Popish Religion, is an evident Proof hereof. The Deposition

position of *Henry III.* by those of the League, was grounded on this Principle, That he favoured the Hereticks. *M. Savil* being then at *Paris*, put the *French* Courtiers to a nonplus, in demanding of them, about the Exclusion of the Duke of *York*, which made a great noise amongst them, Whether they would admit the *Dauphin* to be King, in case he should turn *Hugonot*? By this Question he put a stop to the Reproaches they cast upon the House of Commons upon that account. But at present, when *JAMES II.* has quit the Throne by his flight, the Question is still more easie to be resolved. The Convention having learnt wisdom to their cost, by a more than four years experience, will never be blamed by those who understand the Laws of *France*, for having laid aside a Prince incapable by the Laws to Govern a Protestant State, and who could not perform his Coronation Oath, without wounding his Erroneous Conscience. If after all this, they made choice of the Prince of *Orange*, Who sees not that they therein acted according to the Rules of Justice and Gratitude? They owed their Liberty to the Prince, and the Prince to the Princess; and were not they then obliged to confer the Crown upon those, to whom they were beholden for the Possession of their Rights and Liberties?

The Decision of the sixth Question, depends on the notion they have in *France*, about the nature of the Oaths the King swears to his People at his Coronation; they are the Foundation of those the People afterwards swear to the King, and suppose that the King will perform his Promises and Oaths made to them. Thus it cannot be denied, that they are conditional, and consequently, that they are made void, *ipso facto*, by the Breach of the Promises the Kings have made

to their People. *Eidem non servante Domino, fides impune non servatur*, saith *Alciat in Resp.* 167. n. 10. When the King does not keep his Oath, neither are the Subjects bound to keep theirs. We find that the Parliament, which deposed *Richard the Second*, objected to him his Perjury as to several parts of the Oath he had sworn at his Coronation. And we meet with the same in the History of *France*, in the Acts of Parliament which deposed *Lewis* surnamed *Pious*. Judg after all this, whether Subjects can be oblig'd by an Oath which they do not swear to their Kings, till after the Kings have tied themselves by Oath to their Subjects to perform the Conditions imposed upon them: Surely if any one thinks himself by these Oaths for ever oblig'd to a Prince, so that nothing can free him from that Engagement, he is apparently in an Error. The Oaths of a People to their Prince, are made void by a Conquest made of the State from the Prince that was sworn to. When it is a Conquest properly and strictly so called, which carries along with it the loss of the Rights of the Prince and of his Subjects who had assisted him against the Conqueror. But that has the more place where the People is obliged to join, and does effectually join with a Prince, who is so far from invading their Rights, that he undertakes the Reestablishment and Preservation of them. For in that case he that dispossesses a Prince who is become an Enemy to the State and Commonwealth, enters upon all the legal Rights of that Prince, and has a Right to claim from the People the Oath that is due from the lawful Prince,

C

which

which does disingage the Subjects from their former Oath. Now it is evident that if the Prince of *Orange* has not conquered the State, because the State did actually join and concur with him in his Undertaking, he has at least conquered all the Rights which *James* the Second had upon the State, he being forc'd to quit the Government, after that he had chose rather to employ his Arms against the Prince of *Orange*, than to put an end to all Questions, by calling a Free Parliament, to which the Prince of *Orange* offer'd to submit himself.

These, Sir, in short are the Reasons that make me believe, that French Writers will observe a profound Silence about the present Concerns of *James* the Second. I know well enough that their Spite and Rage may make them employ some false Colours to expose the Proceedings of *England* on this occasion. But after all, Sir, I am perswaded the Court knows its Interest too well, to suffer these Matters to be publicly discuss'd and examin'd. Whatever Design Cardinal *Richelieu* had (who was the Author of all the Troubles under *Charles* the First) in inspiring the zealous Royalists of *England* with Opinions that might makeway for Popery in these Kingdoms, without meeting with any Opposition in this Intrigue; believe me, neither he nor his Successors have ever been able, to inspire the same Maxims into the Divines or Lawyers of *France*. For though they be not in a Condition at present openly to oppose them, as groaning under the enormous Power of *Lewis* the Fourteenth, whom



whom his base Flatterers have deified; yet no sooner shall they see this his Power shaking, but they will take Courage again, and fully display the Power and Authority of the Estates, and make it appear, if ever a Prince of *Orange* come to deliver them from their Oppressor, that they have less regard for *Lewis* the Fourteenth, than the Conventions of *England* and *Scotland* have had for *James* the Second. I conclude with assuring you that I am,

S I R,

Your most Humble, &c.

May 15. 1689.

A. L.

F I N I S.

THE Case of Allegiance in our present Circumstances considered, in a Letter from a Minister in the City to a Minister in the Country.

A Sermon preached at Fulham, in the Chappel of the Palace, upon Easter-Day 1689. at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Father in God Gilbert Lord Bishop of Sarum: By Anthony Horneck, D.D.

The Judgments of God upon the Roman Catholic Church, from its first rigid Laws for universal Conformity to it, unto its last End. Vvith a prospect of these near approaching Revolutions, viz. The Revival of the Protestant Profession in an eminent Kingdom, where it was totally suppressed. The last End of all Turkish Hostilities. The general Mortification of the Power of the Romish Church in all parts of its Dominions. In Explication of the *Trumpets* and *Visals* of the *Apocalypse*, upon Principles generally acknowledged by Protestant Interpreters. By *Dryden* Cressler, D.D.

A Brèviat of the State of *Scotland* in its Government, Supream Courts, Officers of State, Inferiour Officers, Offices and Inferiour Courts, Districts, Jurisdictions, Burroughs Royal, and Free Corporations. Fol.

Some Considerations touching Succession and Allegiance. 4to.

A Discourse concerning the Worship of Images; preached before the University of Oxford. By *George Tully*, Sub-Dean of York, for which he was procured to be suspended by *Obadiab Walker*.

Reflections upon the late Great Revolution: Written by a Lay-Hand in the Country, for the satisfaction of some Neighbours.

The History of the Differtion; or an Account of all the publick Affairs in England, from the beginning of September, 1688. to the Twelfth of February following. With an Answer to a Piece call'd the Differtion discussed, in a Letter to a Country-Gentleman. By a Person of Quality.

*K. William* and *K. Lewis*, wherein is set forth the inevitable necessary these Nations lie under of submitting wholly to one or other of these Kings; And that the matter in Controversy is not now between *K. William* and *K. Jamis*, but between *K. William* and *K. Lewis* of France for the Government of these Nations.

An Examination of the Scruples of those who refuse to take the Oath of Allegiance, by a Divine of the Church of England.

A Dialogue betwixt two Friends, a *Jacobite* and a *Williamite*; occasioned by the late Revolution of Affairs, and the Oath of Allegiance.

Two Sermons, one against Murmuring, the other against Censuring: By *Symon Patrick*, D.D.

An Account of the Reasons which induced *Charles* the Second, King of England, to declare War against the *States General* of the United Provinces in 1672. And of the *Private League* which he entred into at the same Time with the *French King* to carry it on, and to establish Popery in England, Scotland, and Ireland, as they are set down in the History of the Dutch War, printed in French at Paris, with the Priviledg of the French King, 1682. Which Book he caused to be immediately suppress'd at the Instance of the English Ambassador. Fol.

An Account of the Private League betwixt the late King *Jamis* the Second and the French King. Fol.